



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/266,269	03/11/1999	YOSHIHIRO HONMA	35.G2354	5569

5514 7590 04/11/2003

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO  
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA  
NEW YORK, NY 10112

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

WU, DOROTHY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2697	6

DATE MAILED: 04/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/266,269	HONMA, YOSHIHIRO	
<b>Period for Reply</b> -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dorothy Wu	2697	
<b>A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.</li> <li>- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).</li> <li>- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</li> </ul>			
<b>Status</b>			
1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>11 March 1999</u> .			
2a) <input type="checkbox"/> This action is FINAL.                  2b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final.			
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
<b>Disposition of Claims</b>			
4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are pending in the application.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.			
5) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.			
6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are rejected.			
7) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.			
8) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.			
<b>Application Papers</b>			
9) <input type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
10) <input type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) <input type="checkbox"/> accepted or b) <input type="checkbox"/> objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11) <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) <input type="checkbox"/> approved b) <input type="checkbox"/> disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.			
12) <input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.			
<b>Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120</b>			
13) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All    b) <input type="checkbox"/> Some * c) <input type="checkbox"/> None of: 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____. 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.			
14) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) <input type="checkbox"/> The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.			
15) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.			
<b>Attachment(s)</b>			
1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .	
2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .		6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .	

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claims 1-5, 11-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 1, 3, 4, 11-23, the claims state that the display means can read out image data. The display means corresponds to the TV monitor or LCD panel, neither of which can read image data (page 12, lines 10-18). In the disclosure, a captured image reading circuit and superimposing image reading circuit are the only means for reading the first and second image data (page 11, lines 6-9, and Fig. 3), and neither circuit can be interpreted as a display means. Correction is required.

Regarding claims 11, 18-23, the claims state that the image signal forming means can read out image data. Since the claims also state that the image signal forming means generates signals representing a composite image of first and second image data, the functional unit in the disclosure that best matches the image signal forming means is the superimposing circuit (page 11, lines 10-14). The superimposing circuit does not read image data from the storage means. In the disclosure, a captured image reading circuit and superimposing image reading circuit are the only means for reading the first and second image data (page 11, lines 6-9, and Fig. 3), and neither circuit can be interpreted as an image signal forming means. Correction is required.

Regarding claims 15-17, and 21-23, the claims recite the limitations "first condition thereof" and "second condition thereof." There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claims.

Regarding claims 1, 4, 11, 14, 17, 20 and 23, the claim states that the display means and image signal forming means may read both the first and second image data. In the disclosure, a captured image reading circuit reads the first image data and superimposing image reading circuit reads the second image data (page 11, lines 6-9, and Fig. 3). There is no suggestion that the captured image reading circuit may read the second image data as well as the first image data, nor is there any suggestion that the superimposing image reading circuit can read the first image data as well as the second image data.

Regarding claims 19 and 22, the claim states that both the display means and image signal forming means can read the first image data. However, in the disclosure, only one functional unit, i.e. the captured image reading circuit, has the ability to read the first image data (page 11, lines 6-9, and Fig. 3).

Regarding claims 18, 20-23, the claims teach that the display means reads the second image data an order different from the order of reading the first image data, and the image-signal forming means reads the first image data in an order identical to the order of reading the second image data. One of the first and second image data must be read in an order identical to or different from the other of the first and second image data. The first cannot be read in an order different to the second while the second is read in an order identical to the first.

All dependant claims stemming from rejected independent claims are subsequently rejected.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of Parulski et al, U.S. Patent 5,900,909.

As best understood from the language of the claim, regarding claim 1, the admitted prior art teaches an image processing apparatus (page 4, lines 23-24) for forming a composite image of at least two images (page 5, lines 11-15), wherein the image processing apparatus comprising storage means (**21a**) for storing first image data and second image data (page 5, lines 3-10, and Fig. 2), means (**22a, 23a**) for reading the first and second image data stored in the storage means (**21a**), display means (**13a, 15a**) for displaying the read first and second image data (page 5, lines 7-10; page 5, lines 18-24; and Fig. 2), and image-signal forming means (**24a**) for forming image signals representing a composite image based on the first and second image data read from the storage means (page 5, lines 11-15). The admitted prior art does not teach the display of first and second image data in modes adapted for display forms of the first and second image data. Parulski et al teaches the readout of image data in a mode adapted for a display form (col. 4, line 53-col. 5, line 4, and Fig. 9). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the apparatus taught by the admitted prior art with the technique of displaying image data in a mode adapted for a display form taught by Parulski et al to make an image sensing apparatus that can display images in different orientations. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to make such a modification because the rotation of images allows the capture of images in various positions.

Regarding claim 6, because the apparatus according to claim 1 is taught, the method corresponding to the apparatus is also taught.

Regarding claim 2, Parulski et al teaches that image data is respectively read at an arbitrary position in an arbitrary order (col. 4, line 53-col. 5, line 4, and Fig. 9).

Regarding claim 7, because the apparatus according to claim 2 is taught, the method corresponding to the apparatus is also taught.

Regarding claim 3, Parulski teaches that when the display is horizontally positioned, it is desirable to read out images assuming that the camera was held in a horizontal position, but images captured in the portrait orientation need to be rotated (col. 1, lines 34-52). Parulski teaches that this rotation may be achieved by reading out the image data in a different order (col. 4, line 53-col. 5, line 4; and Fig. 9), which reads on the order of reading image data being changed in accordance with whether a display screen for displaying image data is horizontally or vertically positioned.

Regarding claim 8, because the apparatus according to claim 3 is taught, the method corresponding to the apparatus is also taught.

3. Claims 4, 5, 9, 10, 11-14, 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of Parulski et al, U.S. Patent 5,900,909, and further in view of Anderson, U.S. Patent 6,275,260.

Regarding claim 4, the admitted prior art in view of Parulski et al teach an apparatus according to the limitations of claim 2. See above. Parulski teaches that when the display is horizontally positioned, it is desirable to read out images assuming that the camera was held in a horizontal position, but images captured in the portrait orientation need to be rotated (col. 1, lines 34-52). Parulski teaches that this rotation may be achieved by reading out the image data in a different order (col. 4, line 53-col. 5, line 4; and Fig. 9), which reads on the order of reading image data being changed in accordance with whether a display screen for displaying image data is horizontally or vertically positioned. Parulski et al teaches that for images captured at a vertical image-capture position, the image data is read out in an order different from the conventional, horizontal order, and for images captured at a horizontal image-capture position, the image data is read out in the conventional, horizontal order (col. 4, lines 53-64, and Fig. 9). The admitted prior art in view of Parulski et al do not teach that one of the first and second image data is read in an order different from an order of reading the other one of the first and second image data. Anderson teaches that the stamp, which reads on the second image data, is selected and applied (col. 10, lines 18-19), thereby teaching that the stamp is read only one way. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill that the stamp is always read horizontally, as the horizontal order is the conventional order of reading data out of memory. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the apparatus taught by the admitted

prior art in view of Parulski et al with the practice of reading the second image data in the same order at all times taught by Anderson to make an invention that reads one of the first and second image data in an order different from an order of reading the other one of the first and second image data in accordance with whether the display screen is horizontally or vertically positioned. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to make such a motivation to correct for image data needs to be rotated for easier viewing, but to leave data unchanged that is already in an easy to view format.

Regarding claim 9, because the apparatus according to claim 4 is taught, the method corresponding to the apparatus is also taught.

Regarding claim 5, the admitted prior art teaches an image capture means for capturing the image of a subject and supplying image signals corresponding to the captured image to the storage means (page 1, lines 14-16, and page 2, lines 2-4). Parulski et al teaches that when image capture is performed at a vertical image-capture position, the image data is read out in an order different from the conventional, horizontal order, and that when image capture is performed at a horizontal image-capture position, the image data is read out in the conventional, horizontal order (col. 4, lines 53-64, and Fig. 9). Anderson teaches an image captured by the CCD sensor and a stamp, which reads on second image data different from first image data (col. 3, line 65-col. 4, line 1, and col. 7, lines 48-50). Anderson also teaches that the second image data is selected and applied (col. 10, lines 18-19), thereby teaching that the stamp is read only one way. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill that the stamp is always read horizontally, as the horizontal order is the conventional order of reading data out of memory.

Regarding claim 10, because the apparatus according to claim 5 is taught, the method corresponding to the apparatus is also taught.

As best understood from the language of the claim, regarding claim 11, the admitted prior art teaches an image processing apparatus (page 1, lines 13-14) for forming a composite image of at least two images (page 5, lines 11-15). The admitted prior art teaches an image capture means for performing image capture and generating image data corresponding to a captured image of a subject (page 1, lines 14-16). The admitted prior art also teaches storage means (**21a**) for storing first image data generated by the image capture means and second image data (page 5, lines 3-10, and Fig. 2). The admitted prior art teaches means for reading the first and second image data stored in the storage means, and display means (**13a, 15a**) for displaying the read first and second image data (page 5, lines 7-10; page 3, lines 6-13; and Figs. 1 and 2). The admitted prior art teaches an image-signal forming means (**24a**) for forming image signals representing a composite image of a first image represented by the first image data and a second image represented by the second image data so that the first and second images are displayed on a same display screen (page 5, lines 2-21). The admitted prior art teaches output means for externally outputting the video signals formed by the image-signal forming means (page 5, lines 15-24). Parulski et al teaches the readout of image data in a mode adapted for a display form (col. 4, line 53-col. 5, line 4, and Fig. 9). Anderson teaches an image captured by the CCD sensor and a stamp, which reads on second image data different from first image data (col. 3, line 65-col. 4, line 1, and col. 7, lines 48-50).

As best understood from the language of the claim, regarding claim 12, Parulski et al teaches that while image capture is performed at a first, vertical image-capture

position, the image data is read out of the storage means in an order different from the conventional, horizontal order, and that while image capture is performed at a second, horizontal image-capture position, the image data is read out of the storage means in the conventional, horizontal order (col. 4, lines 53-64, and Fig. 9). Anderson also teaches that the second image data is selected and applied (col. 10, lines 18-19), thereby teaching that the stamp is read only one way. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill that the stamp is read horizontally, as the horizontal order is the conventional order of reading data out of memory. The admitted prior art teaches that first and second image data is read out of storage means for display (Fig. 2).

As best understood from the language of the claim, regarding claim 13, Parulski et al teaches that an image sensing apparatus may be rotated so that the image is composed in either a horizontal or vertical orientation, but when the image is displayed, it is assumed that the image sensing apparatus was held in the horizontal position (col. 1, lines 37-43). As the conventional orientation of an image sensing apparatus is the horizontal orientation, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill that data is written horizontally into memory, and that if the image is displayed in a horizontal format, it was read horizontally as well. Thus, irrespective of the position of image capture, the display means reads the first image data in an order identical to the order of writing the first image data.

As best understood from the language of the claim, regarding claim 14, Parulski et al teaches that while image capture is performed at a first, vertical image-capture position, the image data is read out of the storage means in an order different from the conventional, horizontal order, and that while image capture is performed at a second,

horizontal image-capture position, the image data is read out of the storage means in the conventional, horizontal order (col. 4, lines 53-64, and Fig. 9). Anderson also teaches that the second image data is selected and applied (col. 10, lines 18-19), thereby teaching that the stamp is read only one way. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill that the stamp is read horizontally, as the horizontal order is the conventional order of reading data out of memory. Therefore, when image capture is being performed at the first, vertical image-capture position, the image data is read out in an order different from the conventional, horizontal order, and the stamp is read out in the horizontal order, and when image capture is being performed at the second, horizontal image-capture position, the image data and stamp are both read out in the horizontal order.

As best understood from the language of the claim, regarding claim 18, Parulski et al teaches that while image capture is performed at a first, vertical image-capture position, the image data is read out of the storage means in an order different from the conventional, horizontal order, and that while image capture is performed at a second, horizontal image-capture position, the image data is read out of the storage means in the conventional, horizontal order (col. 4, lines 53-64, and Fig. 9). Anderson also teaches that the second image data is selected and applied (col. 10, lines 18-19), thereby teaching that the stamp is read only one way. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill that the stamp is read horizontally, as the horizontal order is the conventional order of reading data out of memory. Therefore, when the image capture is performed at the first, vertical image-capture position, the image data is read out of the storage means in an order different from the conventional, horizontal order while the stamp is read out in the horizontal order, so the order of reading the two images is different. When the image

Art Unit: 2697

capture is performed at the second, horizontal image-capture position, the image data and stamp are both read out of the storage means in the conventional, horizontal order, so the order of reading the two images is the same.

As best understood from the language of the claim, regarding claim 19, Parulski et al teaches that while image capture is performed at a first, vertical image-capture position, the image data is read out of the storage means in an order different from the conventional, horizontal order, and that while image capture is performed at a second, horizontal image-capture position, the image data is read out of the storage means in the conventional, horizontal order (col. 4, lines 53-64, and Fig. 9). The numbering of pixels in Fig. 9 demonstrates that all image data is written into the storage means in the conventional, horizontal order.

As best understood from the language of the claim, regarding claim 20, Parulski et al teaches that while image capture is performed at a first, vertical image-capture position, the image data is read out of the storage means in an order different from the conventional, horizontal order, and that while image capture is performed at a second, horizontal image-capture position, the image data is read out of the storage means in the conventional, horizontal order (col. 4, lines 53-64, and Fig. 9). Anderson also teaches that the second image data is selected and applied (col. 10, lines 18-19), thereby teaching that the stamp is read only one way. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill that the stamp is read horizontally, as the horizontal order is the conventional order of reading data out of memory. Therefore, when the image capture is performed at the first, vertical image-capture position, the image data is read out of the storage means in an order different from the conventional, horizontal order while the stamp is read out in the

horizontal order, so the order of reading the two images is different. When the image capture is performed at the second, horizontal image-capture position, the image data and stamp are both read out of the storage means in the conventional, horizontal order, so the order of reading the two images is the same.

4. Claims 15-17, 21-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of Parulski et al, U.S. Patent 5,900,909, in view of Anderson, U.S. Patent 6,275,260, and further in view of Uekane et al, U.S. Patent 5,559,554, and Takane et al, U.S. Patent 5,850,487.

As best understood from the language of the claim, regarding claim 15, the admitted prior art in view of Parulski et al in view of Anderson teach the apparatus according to the limitations of claim 11. See above. The admitted prior art in view of Parulski et al in view of Anderson do not teach that when the display screen is in the first condition thereof, the second image data is displayed in an orientation different from that of the first image data, and wherein when the display screen is in the second condition thereof, the second image data is displayed in the same orientation as the first image data. Uekane et al teaches that when the display screen is in the self-image picture-taking state I, which reads on the first condition (col. 14, lines 16-20, and Figs. 10 and 13), the first image data is horizontally inverted while the operation, date, and caution indications, which form part of the second image data, is vertically inverted (col. 14, lines 22-36). Uekane et al teaches that when the display screen is in the normal picture-taking state, which reads on the second condition, the first and second image data are read in the same order (col. 13, lines 46-55, and Figs. 9 and 12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the apparatus taught by the admitted prior art in view of Parulski et al in view of Anderson with the practice of inverting the image data in accordance with the condition of the display screen taught by Uekane et al to make an apparatus such that the image data is displayed in different orientations depending upon whether the display screen is in the self-image picture-taking state I or the normal picture-taking state. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to make such a modification so that the image on the display screen is oriented properly when the user flips the camera upside down to photograph himself in the self-image picture taking state I. The admitted prior art in view of Parulski et al in view of Anderson in view of Uekane et al do not teach that the alternate, inverting orientation can be achieved by a different order of reading image data out of memory.

Tekane et al teaches the methods of reading image data from memory such that it is horizontally or vertically inverted (Figs. 10(a) and 10(d)). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the apparatus taught by the admitted prior art in view of Parulski et al in view of Anderson in view of Uekane et al with the methods of reading image data from memory taught by Tekane et al to make an image sensing apparatus such that when the display screen is in the first condition thereof, the display means reads the second image data stored in the storage means in an order different from the order of reading the first image data, and wherein when the display screen is in the second condition thereof, the display means reads the second image data stored in the storage means in an order identical to the order of reading the first image data. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to

Art Unit: 2697

make such a modification to provide a simple method of reading and displaying inverted data when the camera user inverts the camera to photograph himself.

As best understood from the language of the claim, regarding claim 16, Uekane et al teaches that when the display screen is in the self-image picture-taking state I, which reads on the first condition (col. 14, lines 16-20, and Figs. 10 and 13), the first image data is horizontally inverted (col. 14, lines 22-36). Uekane et al teaches that when the display screen is in the normal picture-taking state, which reads on the second condition, the first image data is read in the conventional, horizontal order (col. 13, lines 46-55, and Figs. 9 and 12). Tekane et al teaches the method of reading image data from memory so that it is horizontally inverted (Fig. 10(a)). Parulski teaches that image data is written into memory in the conventional, horizontal manner (Fig. 9).

As best understood from the language of the claim, regarding claim 17, Uekane et al teaches that when the display screen is in the self-image picture-taking state I, which reads on the first condition (col. 14, lines 16-20, and Figs. 10 and 13), the first image data is horizontally inverted while the operation, date, and caution indications, which form part of the second image data, is vertically inverted (col. 14, lines 22-36). Uekane et al teaches that when the display screen is in the normal picture-taking state, which reads on the second condition, the first and second image data are read in the same order (col. 13, lines 46-55, and Figs. 9 and 12). Tekane et al teaches the methods of reading image data from memory such that it is horizontally or vertically inverted (Figs. 10(a) and 10(d)).

As best understood from the language of the claim, regarding claim 21, Uekane et al teaches that when the display screen is in the self-image picture-taking state I, which reads on the first condition (col. 14, lines 16-20, and Figs. 10 and 13), the first image data

is horizontally inverted while the operation, date, and caution indications, which form part of the second image data, is vertically inverted, which reads on the first and second image data being read in different orders (col. 14, lines 22-36). Uekane et al teaches that when the display screen is in the normal picture-taking state, which reads on the second condition, the first and second image data are read in the same order (col. 13, lines 46-55, and Figs. 9 and 12). Tekane et al teaches the methods of reading image data from memory such that it is horizontally or vertically inverted (Figs. 10(a) and 10(d)).

As best understood from the language of the claim, regarding claim 22, Uekane et al teaches that when the display screen is in the self-image picture-taking state I, which reads on the first condition (col. 14, lines 16-20, and Figs. 10 and 13), the first image data is horizontally inverted (col. 14, lines 22-36). Tekane et al teaches the method of reading image data from memory so that it is horizontally inverted (Fig. 10(a)). Uekane et al teaches that when the display screen is in the normal picture-taking state, which reads on the second condition, the first image data is read in the conventional, horizontal order (col. 13, lines 46-55, and Figs. 9 and 12). Parulski teaches that image data is written into memory in the conventional, horizontal manner (Fig. 9).

As best understood from the language of the claim, regarding claim 23, Uekane et al teaches that when the display screen is in the self-image picture-taking state I, which reads on the first condition (col. 14, lines 16-20, and Figs. 10 and 13), the first image data is horizontally inverted while the operation, date, and caution indications, which form part of the second image data, is vertically inverted (col. 14, lines 22-36). Uekane et al teaches that when the display screen is in the normal picture-taking state, which reads on the second condition, the first and second image data are read in the same order (col. 13,

lines 46-55, and Figs. 9 and 12). Tekane et al teaches the methods of reading image data from memory such that it is horizontally or vertically inverted (Figs. 10(a) and 10(d)).

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Boyd et al, U.S. Patent 4,267,555, teaches a rotatable raster scan display.

Moscovitch et al, U.S. Patent 6,343,006, teaches a computer display screen system where the screens may be rotated to a vertical position.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dorothy Wu whose telephone number is 703-305-8412. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kimberly Williams can be reached on 703-305-4863.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, DC 20231

Or faxed to:

703-872-9314

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Art Unit: 2697

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is 703-306-0377

Dorothy m  
DW  
April 1, 2003

KA Williams

Kimberly A. Williams  
Primary Examiner  
Technology Center 2600